The argument for the determining of "enemy character" by domicile rather than by nationality is excellently presented. There is a recognition of international servitudes which some recent writers have hastily presumed to disregard.

Naturally the much-discussed Article 23 (h) of the Hague Convention relative to the Laws and Customs of War on Land receives attention. Article 23 (h) states that it is forbidden "to declare extinguished, suspended, or unenforceable in law, the rights and rights of action of enemy subjects." The German and British interpretation of this article are opposed, and other interpretations are at variance with both. One fact is evident: the next Hague Conference should make the article clear. In general the Anglo-American point of view is supported in the discussion of the effect of war on commercial relations. The provisional and unsatisfactory character of some of the Hague Conventions of 1907, *e. g.* the Convention relative to Submarine Mines, is made plain, but the rapid development from custom to code with provision for compensation or other penalty in case of violation is not overlooked.

The modern recognition of the rights of aliens is evident in many provisions, but the exclusion of claims for indirect and for consequential damages seems to be generally accepted. The extension of the doctrine of internment to war upon the sea and to vessels of war delaying beyond the conventional period in a neutral port is another of the principles which has been recognized in the twentieth century. There is a full and frank acceptance of the category of "unneutral service" which some authors were disinclined to accept a few years ago. The names of cases suggest the recent precedents in international law. *Kowshing, Ryeshitelni, Manjur, Terek, Lena, Askold, Haimun, Quang-Nam*, mingle with the well-known *General Armstrong, Peterhoff*, and *Trent*.

Of the Declaration of London, 1909, the author says that it is likely "to become in a great measure the standard of international action in the future." This statement gains ample support from the fact that the provisions of the Declaration of London are now generally introduced into the instructions issued by various states for the government of their naval forces in their relations to neutrals.

While the references to authorities are generally satisfactory, yet in some cases the references are not to latest editions, as of Calvo, Halleck, Heffter, Lawrence, Nys.

Appendices contain the text of most of the Hague Conventions of 1907 and the Declaration of London of 1909. The Index, which is otherwise good, does not refer to these pages. G. G. W.

CANADA'S FEDERAL SYSTEM. By A. H. F. Lefroy. Toronto: The Carswell Company. 1913. pp. lxviii, 898.

This is an interesting commentary on the British North America Act, 1867, and supplemental acts. The Act differs from ordinary constitutions in that it was not adopted directly or indirectly by the persons whom it governs, and in that it may be amended or repealed precisely as any other statute of the British; but nevertheless, as it is an organic act creating an elaborate system of government for a vast region, it may even be termed, as it sometimes is termed, the Constitution of Canada. It differs greatly from the Constitution of the United States. The very form and phraseology remind the reader of a statute, and not at all of a constitution. Hence it is no surprise to fail to find the familiar provisions of the Constitution of the United States. When one looks below the surface, the difference between the legislative powers created by these two instruments — the two instruments governing almost the whole of one continent — becomes still more striking. Although in each instance we find a Federal Government and State or Provincial Governments, nevertheless in

Canada the position of the Federal Government differs essentially from the position of the Federal Government in the United States. As the author says, "the possession by the Federal Government of the veto power over provincial legislation is one of those special features of the Constitution of the Dominion which distinguishes it from the Constitution of the United States of America." Elsewhere the author explains that in the British North America Act are not contained our familiar provisions as to eminent domain, bills of attainder, *ex post facto* laws, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts. All these diversities, and other points of interest, may be found in paragraphs 12, 24, 31–33, and 51–53, and on pages 30–44, 84–85, 101, 125, 230, 394, 417, and 742–758. These references will enable any one to gain from the book a quick perception of the peculiarities of the Canadian system, from the point of view of the United States. The necessary documents, including the British North America Act, 1867, are given in an appendix, and on pages 787–791 may be found sections 91 and 92, which are the principal passages of that Act which show the respective powers of the Dominion and of the Provinces.

Although a commentary on the British North America Act, 1867, unlike a commentary on the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, 1900, cannot cite many cases from the United States and cannot much resemble a commentary on our own Constitution, nevertheless this volume should attract attention in the United States, since it is a lawyer-like piece of work and serves excellently the desirable end of presenting clearly the governmental system of neighbors with whom our relations are constantly growing more intimate.

NATIONAL SUPREMACY: TREATY POWER *v.* STATE POWER. By Edward S. Corwin. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1913. pp. viii, 321.

There are so few books dealing with the border-land between International Law and Constitutional Law that this volume must be welcomed. Near the beginning (p. 8) the author draws clearly the distinction between holding that a treaty is "legally binding upon the United States as a person at International Law" and holding that it is "legally binding upon all individuals and things subject to the jurisdiction of the United States." The discussion of this distinction is presented so well as to arouse an expectation that the whole volume may be a useful contribution. Yet the remainder of the volume is principally devoted to familiar generalities and almost equally familiar quotations from judicial opinions; and when the author does deal with concrete problems, as in the instance of the Japanese difficulties in California (Chapter VIII), the discussion is inadequate and unconvincing.

PRINCIPLES OF THE LAW OF PERSONAL PROPERTY. Intended for the Use of Students in Conveyancing. By the late Joshua Williams. The Seventeenth Edition, by his son, T. Cyprian Williams. Toronto: The Carswell Company. 1913.

The treatises on the Law of Real Property and on the Law of Personal Property by that master of the Common Law, the late Mr. Joshua Williams, as edited by his accomplished son, have for their accuracy, lucidity, and felicity of expression won the despairing admiration of legal text-writers. The present edition sustains the reputation of its predecessors.

The mass of Victorian legislation affecting the Law of Personal Property is great, and has of course to be taken account of by Mr. Williams. Many pages of this edition have, therefore, no direct application on America, but there is much besides that has a real and lasting value here. J. C. G.